

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/516,718	03/01/2000	Hajime Oda	F-6461	2689	
7:	590 12/13/2002		•		
Jordon and Hamburg			EXAMINER		
122 East 42nd New York, NY			BHAT, ADITYA S		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2863		
			DATE MAIL ED: 12/13/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/516,718	HAJIME ODA, CHIBA-KEN				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Aditya S Bhat	2863				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 27 November 2002 FAILS TO PL. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this applic (1) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in				
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expi ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f).	re later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin /AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Common timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	nd of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply Office later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
	•					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant argument is not found to be persausive because his argument is not supported by the ciaim. Applicant argues regarding a photovoltaic sensor, when only a sensor is claimed. Second, the reference states a CPU switching a switch to input the output for the sensor(Col.9 Lines 64-66). Thus, showing that the CPU is controlling the sensors. Finally the applicant argue that "unwanted auxiliary light is not projected to avoid energy waste of the power supply" is not the same as turnning off the power supply to the sensors. However, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to turn off the power to the sensors as oppsed to the projecting unit in order to avoid energy waste. The light is projected by the projecting means and the light is detected by the sensors. The CPU controls both the sensors as well as the ligh tprojecting means and it would be obvious to shut either off in order to conserve power.

John Barlow

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800